DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 895 UD 025 388

AUTHOR	Goodis, Tracy Ann
TITLE	Adaptation Processes of Recent Immigrants to the United States: A Review of the Demographic and Social Aspects. Policy Discussion Paper.
INSTITUTION	Urban Inst., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Ahmanson Foundation, Beverly Hills, CA.; Atlantic Richfield Foundation, Los Angeles, CA.; Times Mirror Foundation, Los Angeles, CA.; Weingart Foundation, Los Angeles, CA.
REPORT NO	PDS-86-3
PUB DATE	Dec 86
NOTE	52p.; For related documents, see UD 025 387 and ED 281 934-935. Part of The Urban Institute's larger project, Study of the Impacts of Immigration in California.
AVAILABLE FROM	Library/Information Clearinghouse, The Urban Institute, 2100 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037 ($7.50).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Acculturation; *Adjustment (to Environment); *Demography; Foreign Nationals; *Immigrants; Population Trends; *Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS	*Immigration Legislation

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the recent literature on the demographic and social aspects of immigrant adaptation. Demographic information includes age and family structure, fertility behavior, intermarriage, and residential segregation. Social dimensions refer to native-language retention, English-language acquisition, and educational attainment. Most studies conclude that there are few significant differences between the grandchildren of immigrants and the native population in the United States overall. For example, for third-generation Mexican-American women, current fertility converges to the levels for non-Hispanic White women. Also, English fluency among Hispanics and Asians increases dramatically for subsequent native-born generations, and in some cases the transition from an immigrant's native language to English is complete by the third generation. For the Japanese, English fluency increases from one-fifth among the immigrant generation to 100 percent for third-generation Japanese-Americans. There is also evidence that success of the immigrant generation in adjusting to life in this country increases with length of residence. (Author/LHW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

3-12-89

ED283895

Adaptation Processes of Recent Immigrants to the United States:

A Review of Demographic and Social Aspects

by

Tracy Ann Goodis

The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

December 1986
PDS-86-3

This Policy Discussion Paper was prepared as part of The Urban Institute's larger project, Study of the Impacts of Immigration in California, funded by the Weingart Foundation, the Atlantic Richfield Foundation, the Ahmanson Foundation, and the Times Mirror Foundation. The helpful comments of Thomas Espenshade and Edward Taylor are gratefully acknowledged, as is the capable technical assistance of Terri Murray. Conclusions or opinions expressed in Institute publications are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of other staff members, officers or trustees of the Institute, advisory groups, or any organizations that provide financial support to the Institute.

UD025388

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Williamson
Urban Institute

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOREWORD

Issues concerning the level and composition of immigration to the United States have assumed prominent positions on the agendas of many policymakers. Perhaps nowhere are immigration's effects more keenly felt than in California, where one-quarter of all foreign-born persons in the United States currently reside.

This Policy Discussion Paper series is aimed at improving the quality of the policy-making process through a broad distribution of research findings on the consequences of immigration to California. These dissemination activities are part of The Urban Institute's larger project, Study of the Impacts of Immigration in California, funded by the Weingart Foundation, the Atlantic Richfield Foundation, the Ahmanson Foundation, and the Times Mirror Foundation. Important policy issues being addressed include (a) economic and fiscal issues associated with immigration, (b) the character and tempo of assimilation processes, and (c) the impact on California of proposals for immigration reform. All major immigrant groups to California--not just Mexicans--are being included, as are the comparative effects in northern as well as in southern California.

The Urban Institute's objective is to make a positive contribution to the policy process. It is committed to getting its work into the hands of people who can use it and rely upon it to make judgments of their own on future policy directions. Related titles are listed at the end of this paper.

Thomas J. Espenshade
Director
Program in Demographic Studies

ADAPTATION PROCESSES OF RECENT IMMIGRANTS TO THE UNITED STATES:
A REVIEW OF DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL ASPECTS

Executive Summary

The surge in Asian and Hispanic immigration that began during the 1970s and has continued into the 1980s is renewing interest and concern over the impacts and adaptation processes of these recent arrivals. Questions about how well new immigrants are adjusting to life in the United States and what accommodations by the host population may be necessary to ensure a smooth transition are of special interest.

This paper reviews the recent literature on the demographic and social aspects of immigrant adaptation. Demographic dimensions include age and family structure, fertility behavior, intermarriage, and residential segregation. Social dimensions refer to native-language retention, English-language acquisition, and educational attainment. Most studies conclude that there are few significant differences between the grandchildren of immigrants and the native population overall. For example, for third-generation Mexican-American women, current fertility converges to the levels for other non-Hispanic white women. Also, English fluency among Hispanics and Asians increases dramatically for subsequent native-born generations, and in some cases the transition from an immigrant's native language to English is complete by the third generation. For the Japanese, English fluency increases from one-fifth among the immigrant generation to 100 percent for third-generation Japanese-Americans. There is also evidence suggesting that the success of the immigrant generation in adjusting to life in the United States increases with their length of residence.

INTRODUCTION

The surge in immigration to the United States that began during the 1970s and has continued into the 1980s is renewing interest and concern over the impacts and adaptation processes of these recent arrivals. Questions about how well new immigrants are adjusting to life in the United States and what accommodations by the host population may be necessary to ensure a smooth transition are of special interest. These concerns are prompted not only by the large number of new arrivals (including both legal and illegal immigrants) and the shift in the ethnic and racial composition of this recent immigrant population, but also by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, which promises legal amnesty to potentially millions of illegal aliens living in the United States. Although Europeans still accounted for the largest component of the foreign-born population in the United States in 1980 (30 percent), Latin Americans made up 28 percent and 16 percent were of Asian origin. Significantly, Mexicans comprised 56 percent of all Latin American immigrants. Recent immigration patterns illustrate a rapid increase in the immigration rates of both Asians and Hispanics. For example, over three-fourths of the 3.3 million foreign-born persons living in the United States in 1980 and who arrived between 1975 and 1980 were either Asian or Hispanic; by contrast, European immigrants comprised just 9 percent of the total.

The dramatic shift in the countries of origin of these new immigrants has led to speculation that the adaptation patterns believed to exist among earlier European immigrants are either not relevant to the experiences of this recent immigrant population, or that adjustment processes of recent immigrants are not occurring at the same speed as for the Europeans. Although there is no general consensus on what constitutes complete integration, Europeans are

most frequently thought of as an immigrant population that has been fully "Americanized." By learning the language and adopting the cultural behaviors and values of their new homeland, the early European immigrants were able to improve their socioeconomic status, thus achieving mobility into the mainstream of society.

Asians, often referred to as a "model minority," appear to be emulating the socioeconomic success of the early European immigrants; however, questions still remain regarding their acceptance into all aspects of American life. For instance, almost every major metropolitan area with a high concentration of Asians boasts a "Chinatown," "Little Korea" or "Little Tokyo," suggesting that residential segregation among Asians may be widespread. Moreover, a few universities--especially in California—that are concerned over their large number of Asian students are proposing quotas to limit the admittance of Asians. It is also important to note that Asians are a heterogeneous group, comprised of persons from a diversity of nations including China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and Vietnam. Each group exhibits different levels of educational and occupational attainment. The recent Vietnamese refugee population has considerably less education, income, and transferable job skills than other Asian immigrant groups, a fact that may hinder social mobility for the Vietnamese population.

By contrast, the popular conception of Hispanics is one of an immigrant group moving slowly toward economic parity with the native-born population. On average, their occupational and educational achievements have lagged behind those of native-born persons, and improvements in their economic status have been slower in coming. Some observers maintain that barriers to social mobility such as discrimination have thwarted attempts made by Hispanics to

improve their status. In fact, Portes and Bach (1985) found that Hispanics who desired upward mobility were the most discouraged by the discrimination they encountered as they attempted to advance into American society. Others offer the argument that it is the Hispanics themselves who limit their achievements by clinging to the behaviors and values of their countries of origin. It is this perception that has aroused fears that areas with high concentrations of Hispanics--Miami, for instance--may become another Quebec. Indeed, movements promoting bilingual education and bilingual election ballots have been opposed to by groups proposing legislation establishing English as the official language of the United States. A general consensus seems to be developing that if Europeans who entered this country during the early 1900s could learn English, the same should be true of the recent Hispanic immigrant population. As the number of Hispanic arrivals continues to grow, it appears likely that these types of comparisons will become more frequent.

The process of immigrant adaptation has several dimensions including, for example, demographic, social, economic, and political. This paper focuses on the demographic and social aspects of immigrant adjustment. Demographic dimensions include age and family structure, fertility behavior, propensities for intermarriage, and patterns of residential segregation. Social dimensions refer to native-language retention, English-language acquisition, and educational attainment. For each dimension, our review of the recent literature on the adaptation experiences of Asians and Hispanics reveals that it is possible to construct objective indicators to measure the degree of immigrant adjustment. One underlying presumption is that the presence of adjustment or adaptation is suggested by a narrowing of the gap in numerical values of objective indicators between immigrants and/or their first- or second-generation descendants and the native-born host population.

This paper has three objectives. First, we will examine how the various Asian and Hispanic immigrant groups fare in terms of their speed of adjustment along demographic and social dimensions. Second, we will identify immigrant adaptation processes occurring within an immigrant cohort and also across generations of immigrants and their subsequent native-born descendants. Third, we will attempt to identify barriers to and/or facilitators of the adjustment process.

DEMOGRAPHIC DIMENSIONS OF IMMIGRANT ADAPTATION

Age and Family Structure

In 1980 the median age of the Hispanic foreign-born population was 31.4 years, slightly higher than the median age of 30.0 for the total U.S. population and 29.4 years for the native-born population. The median ages for the various foreign-born Hispanic populations varied from a low of 29.1 years for Mexicans to a high of 43.9 for Cubans. The median age of the foreign-born population from Central America and South America was 34.4 years and 32.9 years, respectively (Fernandez and Cresce, 1985). The median age of the total Hispanic population in 1980, including those born in the United States, was 23.2 years (Gardner, Robey, and Smith, 1985).

Proportionately more foreign-born Hispanic males 15 years of age or older reported their marital status as married in 1980 (64 percent) than their counterparts in the total U.S. population (61 percent) and the native-born population (60 percent). Similarly, a higher proportion of foreign-born Hispanic females were married in 1980 (60 percent) than of the total female population (55 percent) or the native born (55 percent). In general, the Hispanic foreign born had a lower proportion divorced (3 percent) than the total U.S. population (5 percent) and the native born (5 percent).

Interestingly, Fernandez and Cresce (1985) found that for the foreign-born Cubans, Central Americans, and South Americans who immigrated to the United States prior to 1959, the proportions divorced were at least as high as those of the native-born population. The researchers conclude "in these cases, the societal values of the host nation may have proven stronger than religious values in altering traditional Hispanic attitudes about the permanence of marriage" (p. 9). However, the Mexican foreign born maintained lower proportions divorced than the native born in every immigration period.

On average, the typical Hispanic family in 1980 contained about one more person than did the average white family (Moore and Pachon, 1985). Mexican-Americans had the largest families with 4.07 persons, followed by Puerto Ricans with 3.67 persons, Cubans with 3.58 persons, and lastly other Spanish with 3.37 persons. These figures represent a slight drop in family size from 1970. The size of Hispanic households—including all persons living in a housing unit whether or not they are related— also differs from the size of average white and black households. For example, in 1980 the average Hispanic household contained 3.5 persons. White households were comprised of an average of 2.7 persons and, on average, black households contained 3.1 persons (Gardner et al., 1985).

The age structure of the Asian population in the United States varies from a high median age of 33.5 years for Japanese Americans to a low of 21.5 years for the Vietnamese. The median ages for the Chinese (29.6), the Filipinos (28.5), and the Koreans (26.0) were lower than the 30.0 median age for the total U.S. population. According to Gardner et al. (1985), the high median age of the Japanese is due to low fertility, high life expectancy, and the relatively low level of recent Japanese immigration. On the other hand,

Vietnamese immigration has accelerated during the past decade; in fact, prior to 1975 Vietnamese immigration to the United States was practically nonexistent. Because immigrants in general tend to be younger than the host population, the low median age of the Vietnamese could be a result of their recent arrival in the United States (Gardner et al., 1985). Also, the Vietnamese have higher fertility than other Asian groups, which also influences their age structure.

According to 1980 census data, the average size of Asian households varied from a low of 2.7 persons for the Japanese to a high of 4.4 persons for the Vietnamese. Asian Indian households contained 2.9 persons, followed by the Chinese with 3.1 persons, Koreans with 3.4 persons, and Filipinos with 3.6 persons. For all Asian groups, with the exception of the Vietnamese, the average household size of the immigrants arriving in the United States between 1975 and 1980 was larger than for the group taken as a whole. For example, the average household size of recent Japanese immigrants rose to 2.9 persons and for Asian Indians household size averaged 3.5 persons. For those Chinese arriving in the United States between 1975 and 1980 average household size rose to 3.9 persons, recent Korean immigrant households contained 4.8 persons, and for Filipinos average household size was 5.4 persons. The average household size of recent Vietnamese immigrants was identical to the 4.4 persons for the total group. Gardner et al. (1985) explain that the households of recent Asian immigrants contain much higher proportions of "other relatives" exclusive of the householder, spouse, and children, which accounts for their larger size. For instance, only 12 percent of all Filipino households contained other relatives compared to 54 percent of recent immigrant Filipino households. This pattern was similar for all other Asian groups.

Gardner et al. (1985) speculate that most of these "other relatives" provide the household with additional income and/or child care, which allow other family members the opportunity to continue their education or seek employment. This strategy allows Asians to take the first step toward upward socioeconomic mobility. But the researchers also point out that even among the more established Asian groups--the Japanese and Chinese, for example--household size and/or composition remains different from white households in the Unites States. They feel it is too early to tell whether the households of Asians will alter significantly and begin to resemble white households more closely.

Wolpin (1984) found that immigrants in general were less likely to live in nuclear households than the native population. The greatest divergence from the native population was found for Cuban, Mexican, and Asian immigrants. Using data from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, he examined the effect of length of residence in the United States on the size and composition of immigrant households. Wolpin found that a newly arrived male immigrant would be observed in a nuclear household about 71 percent of the time, compared to a native who would be observed in such a household 86 percent of the time. After residing in the United States for 20 years, an immigrant and a native would have about the same likelihood of being observed in a nuclear household, and after 40 years of residence the immigrant would have a slightly increased likelihood. Thus, convergence to the household structure of natives is nearly complete after 20 years, even for Mexicans, Cubans, and Asians.

Fertility Behavior

Observed fertility differences between the foreign-born and native-born population have prompted investigations into the sources of these

differentials and the effects of exposure to life in the United States. Much of the literature addressing these concerns attempts to explain fertility differentials based on two complementary, yet competing, theories--the "characteristics hypothesis" and the "minority group status hypothesis."

According to the characteristics hypothesis, fertility differences are attributed to differences in the social, economic, and demographic characteristics of the majority population and a given ethnic group. Once education, occupation, income, and other social class differences are removed, fertility differentials should disappear. The minority group status hypothesis admits the relevance of socioeconomic factors but also asserts that belonging to an ethnic minority exerts an independent effect on fertility. For example, if prospects for upward mobility are good, a minority group will attempt to conserve its resources by lowering fertility in order to take advantage of socioeconomic opportunities. On the other hand, if inadequate channels for social mobility exist, a minority group would have high fertility in order to increase its numbers and relative position in society. How well do these models fit the fertility patterns of Hispanics and Asians, and what alternative theories have been proposed?

Using 1980 census data, Fernandez and Cresce (1985) found that fertility for foreign-born Hispanic women over the age of 15 was approximately 2.9 children ever born per woman. This figure was substantially higher than the 2.4 children per comparable native-born woman. Among the Hispanic foreign-born, Mexicans had the highest fertility at 3.5 children per woman, and the lowest rate--1.9 children per women--was recorded for foreign-born Cuban women. For Central American women the figure was 2.5 children ever born per woman, and South American women reported 2.1 children.

Using data from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Bean and Swicegood (1982) analyzed the effects of exposure to the receiving society (measured by generation) and rising socioeconomic status (measured by female education) on the current and cumulative fertility of Mexican-American women. They found the current fertility--the number of children under the age of three--and the cumulative fertility--the number of children under the age of 15--of Mexican-American women to be substantially higher than fertility rates of other white (non-Hispanic) women. However, the current and cumulative fertility of Mexican-American women were found to decrease both with length of residence in the United States and with rising socioeconomic status. For Mexican-American women of higher generations and greater education, the reduction in cumulative fertility is lower than would be expected when the effects of these two variables are analyzed separately. This finding lends support to what researchers term a modified minority group status theory which suggests that a woman in an intermediate stage of adaptation--a situation in which she is not fully integrated with her own minority group or the majority group--may compensate for her position by exhibiting lower fertility than her "more-assimilated" counterparts.

Bean, Cullen, Stephen, and Swicegood (1984) further explored the effect of generation on the fertility of Mexican women. Using data from the 1970 census, a series of regression models was estimated that controlled for the influence of other variables such as age, education, and female labor force participation. The results revealed a tendency toward declining fertility levels with rising generational status of Mexican women. In the case of third- or higher-generation Mexican women, current fertility converges to the levels for other non-Hispanic white women. Because Mexican immigrant women

tend to exhibit very high levels of current fertility, the researchers attribute the decrease in current fertility associated with rising generational status to the interaction of both "subcultural" and "assimilationist" forces. For example, the fertility behavior of Mexican immigrant women may be influenced to a great extent by the values and accepted behaviors of their country of origin. On the other hand, Bean et al. assert that assimilationist forces shape the behavior of later-generation Mexican-American women.

This idea is expressed by Beaujot, Krotki, and Krishnan (1982) as "the particularized ideology hypothesis" which relates fertility to the values and norms--such as ideas about family size--that make up ethnic identity. Using survey data for over 1,000 women in Edmonton, Canada, the researchers found that the fertility level of the least-assimilated individuals--measured by generation, language use, and intermarriage--generally mirrored the pattern typical of their particular ethnic group. The role of cultural variables on the fertility behavior of Mexicans has yet to be fully analyzed and explained.

Unlike Hispanics, Asian women reported lower fertility in 1980 than the total U.S. population and the white population (Gardner et al., 1985). According to 1980 census data, the number of children ever born for Asian women aged 15 to 44 years was 1.16. The figure for all women in the United States 15 to 44 years of age was 1.43 and for white women it was 1.36 children ever born. Among Asians, the Vietnamese had the highest fertility at 1.79, and the lowest, 0.91, was recorded for the Japanese. Chinese fertility was 1.02 children ever born per woman; for Korean women it was 1.14; and Filipinos and Asian Indians both reported 1.22.

For all groups except Filipinos and Asian Indians, native-born Asians aged 25 to 34 years had lower fertility than the foreign-born in the same age group. For example, for native-born Japanese the average number of children ever born per woman was 0.77 compared to 1.10 for the foreign-born Japanese. Similarly, native-born Chinese exhibited fertility of 0.67, much lower than the 1.02 for foreign-born Chinese. Average fertility for all native-born Asians was 0.95, compared to 1.27 for Asian immigrants. Fertility also decreased with rising educational attainment of Asian women. For women with fewer than nine years of schooling fertility was 2.03 compared with 0.73 for women with 17 or more years of schooling. For Japanese and Korean women, however, those with less than nine years of schooling had slightly lower fertility than those with nine to twelve years (Gardner et al., 1985).

Johnson and Nishida (1980) analyzed data from the 1970 census for Hawaii and California in order to test how well the minority group status hypothesis explained the fertility behavior of native-born Asians. Because no single ethnic or racial group made up 50 percent of the population in Hawaii in 1970, minority status can not explain differences in fertility for the Chinese, Japanese, or white populations. But, according to the minority group status theory, Chinese and Japanese women should exhibit lower fertility in California--where they are a minority group that either desires or has achieved some degree of socioeconomic mobility--than in Hawaii. Johnson and Nishida's findings support the minority group status hypothesis. In California, Japanese and Chinese women aged 14 to 44 years exhibited lower fertility than Japanese and Chinese women in the same age group in Hawaii. For example, in California Japanese women averaged 2.00 children per woman and the Chinese had 2.01 compared with 2.44 for the Japanese and 2.85 for the

Chinese in Hawaii. However, information on country of parental birth was unavailable and the researchers could not separate the effects of age and generational status on fertility. Therefore, the researchers caution against prematurely accepting the minority group status hypothesis as sufficient to explain the fertility behavior of Asians.

Gurak (1978) suggests that the fertility behavior of Asians and Hispanics is too complex to be fully explained by either the minority group status hypothesis or the characteristics hypothesis. Using data from the 1970 census, Gurak examined the fertility--defined as the number of children ever born to currently married women between the ages of 35 and 45--of native-born non-Spanish whites, native-born blacks, and native and foreign-born Japanese, Cubans, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans.

Controlling for socioeconomic characteristics such as education, occupation, income, and age at marriage significantly reduced the fertility differentials between native-born whites and the Japanese and Puerto Ricans. Status differentials alone accounted for the higher fertility of Puerto Ricans relative to the white population, whereas age at marriage exerted the strongest influence on the lower fertility of the Japanese. Although these findings apparently support the characteristics hypothesis, Gurak argues that the tendency for the Japanese to marry at an older age may be an ethnically rooted behavior pattern. Moreover, whereas differences in socioeconomic status explain some of the gap in fertility between Mexicans and whites, Mexican fertility remains high at all status levels. According to Gurak, the high fertility of Mexicans appears to result from a cultural preference for large families rather than from belonging to a minority group or from compositional differences.

Differences with whites in social characteristics did not explain the lower fertility of Cubans. Gurak admits that "it appears probable that the low Cuban fertility results from adaptations to the strains and insecurities caused by the sudden displacement of the 1960s" (p. 308) which supports the minority group status hypothesis. However, he questions whether the Cubans' situation is characteristic of a minority experience or a short-term phenomenon. According to Gurak, an analysis based on longitudinal data rather than cross-sectional data is necessary before any firm conclusions can be drawn. Also, any future work on the sources of fertility differentials should include some measure of cultural preferences and behaviors that are culturally rooted.

The evidence presented above is inconclusive as to whether the minority status theory or the characteristics hypothesis best explains the fertility differentials between Asians, Hispanics, and the native population. It seems that certain elements of each theory fit the data well, yet neither hypothesis can stand alone as a complete interpretation of immigrant fertility behavior. Perhaps further work should, as Gurak suggests, include a variable or variables that take into account cultural preferences.

Intermarriage

Changes in social distance—that is, in relations between persons of different ethnic or racial backgrounds—are difficult to measure. For example, there are little or no data on friendships, casual associations, entrance into social networks, or other types of social relationships individuals establish. However, if marriage can be considered "the most profound and lasting human relation of all those voluntarily established" (Blau, Beeker, and Fitzpatrick, 1984:591), then rates of intermarriage can be

used as a good indicator of the degree of social acceptance of a minority group by a majority population.

Bugelski (1961) examined intermarriage trends in Buffalo, New York between 1930 and 1960. He found that ingroup marriages among Italians decreased from 71 percent of all marriages involving Italians in 1930 to 27 percent in 1960. The Polish population experienced a similar decline from 79 percent to 33 percent. Based on these trends Bugelski speculated that ingroup marriages among Europeans of the same ethnic background would become rare by 1975. Alba's (1985) analysis of intermarriage trends based on the 1980 census confirmed Bugelski's hypothesis. He found that, among native-born, non-Hispanic whites, intermarriage is now commonplace. In fact, only 25 percent of all marriages among native-born, non-Hispanic whites involve two individuals of the same ethnic heritage. Also, intermarriage across ethnic lines for native-born, non-Hispanic whites is more common among younger cohorts. However, only 2 percent of all marriages of U.S.-born individuals crossed racial or Hispanic-ancestry boundaries. Alba noted that these results point to a "striking divergence between the experiences of European and non-European groups in the United States" (p. 18). This is not to say that intermarriage does not occur in non-European groups. For example, in 1980 30 percent of native-born Hispanic and native-born Asian individuals married outside their group (Alba, 1985).

The extent of intermarriage can be calculated using either the number of <u>individuals</u> who marry outside their group or on the number of <u>marriages</u> involving persons of different ethnic heritages. For example, imagine a situation involving two black females and two black males. One black male marries a white female, one marries a black female, and the remaining black

female marries a white male. Given this scenario, two-thirds of these marriages are considered intermarriages yet only one-half of the individuals in our original group intermarried. Therefore, when comparing the intermarriage rates of various ethnic groups it is important to distinguish whether these rates are based on the number of marriages or the number of individuals who have intermarried.

Murguia and Cazares (1982) analyzed the findings of a number of studies which reported on the intermarriage rates of Mexicans in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. Based on both the percentage of individuals intermarrying and the number of intermarriages, they found a leveling off or even a decrease in the outmarriage rates of Mexican-Americans in counties where outmarriage rates had been high. On the other hand, areas where intermarriage rates were previously recorded at very low levels experienced a continuing trend of increasing rates. For example, a significant increase in intermarriage rates beginning in 1970 was found in Pecos County, Texas, a nonmetropolitan area where rates of outmarriage historically have been low (Cazares, Murguia, and Frisbie, 1984). This result signals a decrease in social distance between the white population and Mexican-Americans. According to the authors, this convergence of intermarriage rates across counties could be attributed to the possibility that the greater ethnic tolerance in areas of high rates of intermarriage attracted first-generation Mexicans whose rates of intermarriage are low. In areas of low rates of intermarriage, decreasing ethnic barriers resulting from civil rights legislation may have promoted intermarriage.

Murguia and Cazares also summarize the findings of other studies that have examined the relationship of social class, generation, and group size to

Mexican intermarriage. For example, according to Grebler, Moore, and Guzman (1970) upward mobility among Mexicans is positively related to intermarriage. Moreover, Bossard (1939) and Grebler et al. (1970) found that second-generation native-born Mexicans exhibit higher rates of intermarriage than found among first-generation native-born Mexicans who, in turn, tend to outmarry to a greater extent than do foreign-born Mexicans. Thus, the greater the number of generations separating an individual from their immigrant ancestors, the greater the propensity to outmarry. Lastly, Holscher, Varni, and Naranjo (1979) found that the greater the number and proportion of Mexicans in an area, the less likely it is that intermarriage will occur. Based on data from New Mexico, the authors found that those counties which contained the greatest percentage of Mexicans relative to the majority population exhibited the lowest rates of intermarriage.

Although a slow increase in the rate of Mexican-American intermarriage is predicted by Murguia and Cazares (1982), these authors also identify three factors that may keep Mexicans from complete absorption into the majority population. First, although most are classified as white, Mexicans are physically distinct from the majority population. Thus their physical characteristics could pose a barrier to intermarriage in the same way that racial distinctions do. Second, as immigration to the United States continues, the population of first-generation Mexicans will increase. As mentioned earlier, this group has a lower rate of intermarriage than do subsequent generations. Third, contact with Mexico via movement back and forth across the border is made easy by Mexico's geographic location.

Intermarriage trends of the Asian population during the 1970s in Hawaii and California were examined by Kitano, Yeung, Chai, and Hatanaka (1984).

Overall, the Japanese had the highest rate of intermarriage in Los Angeles, followed by the Chinese and the Koreans. In 1977, the peak year for all three groups, the proportion intermarrying among the Japanese was 63.1 percent of all marriages contracted in that year; for the Chinese it was 49.7 percent and for the Koreans it was 34.1 percent. It is important to note that some of these intermarriages were to other Asians. When these types of marriages are excluded, outmarriage in 1979 falls from 60.6 percent to 49.9 percent for the Japanese, from 41.2 percent to 30.2 percent for the Chinese, and from 27.6 percent to 19.2 percent for the Koreans. The rates of intermarriage for Asian females were much higher than for males in all three groups.

Generational differences were the most important factor related to intermarriage (Kitano et al., 1984), with the third-generation outmarrying at a higher rate than first-generation Asians. For example, first-generation Chinese females had outmarriage rates of 18.4 percent compared to 74.0 percent for the third-generation. Montero's (1981) findings for the Japanese population also support this conclusion. He found the outmarriage rate for first-generation Japanese to be less than 1 percent; it rose to 10 percent for the second generation and climbed to 40 percent for the third generation. Woodrum (1981) also found that both intermarriage rates and tolerance toward intermarriage with whites to increase with generation for the Japanese.

Data from Hawaii reveal that the rates of intermarriage for the Chinese remained relatively stable throughout the 1970s, whereas the Japanese showed a steady rise and the Koreans a slight decrease although the overall figures were high (Kitano et al., 1984). Contrasting with the findings from Los Angeles, the Korean population in Hawaii had the highest rate of intermarriage--88 percent in 1970 and 83 percent in 1980. In 1970, 79 percent

of the Chinese outmarried, compared to 76 percent in 1980. The proportion intermarrying among the Japanese was 47 percent in 1970 and 59 percent in 1980.

According to a model of outmarriage proposed by Kitano et al. (1984), high rates of intermarriage would be expected under the following conditions: (a) small group size, (b) high motivation to become American coupled with little emphasis on ethnic or cultural identity, (c) a liberal family orientation, (d) a weak ethnic community, and (e) existence in a racially tolerant society. The circumstances of the Koreans in Hawaii approximates these conditions rather closely, and their high rate of intermarriage provides support for this model. Moreover, the increase in Japanese and Chinese rates of outmarriage across generations offers additional supporting evidence.

An alternative approach proposed by Blau, Beeker, and Fitzpatrick (1984) asked whether intermarriages occurred more frequently in metropolitan areas where individuals of different ethnic and racial backgrounds, but of similar socioeconomic characteristics, were more likely to come into contact with each other. Based on data from the 1970 census of 125 of the largest SMSAs in the United States, racial and ethnic intermarriage was found to occur more frequently in areas where boundaries to social contact were the weakest. In other words, in areas where individuals of different ethnic and racial backgrounds live, work, and socialize together, intermarriage will be more likely. Thus, even if everyone had a preference to marry an individual of their own ethnic heritage, increased social contact would promote intermarriage.

The experiences of Asians, whose socioeconomic status and rates of intermarriage are high, lend partial support to Blau's theory. However, little is known about the patterns of residential segregation of Asians. Also, due to the recency of Asian immigration in great numbers, it is difficult to tell, based on the Kitano et al. (1984) model, whether these rates will continue at the high levels now observed. Finally, if the model offered by Blau et al. (1984) holds true for the 1980s and beyond, we can expect Hispanic intermarriage to increase, albeit at a rate approximately equal to the speed of their socioeconomic achievement and movement into the mainstream of U.S. society.

Residential Segregation

Research on residential segregation--the physical separation of different population groups according to their place of residence--has until recently concentrated on the level of black-white segregation in American cities. The increase in the flow of immigrants to the United States during the 1970s, especially immigrants from Latin American and Asian countries, has spawned a growing body of literature focused on the degree of residential segregation between the majority population and some groups of these recent immigrant arrivals. Although concentrations of Asian immigrants in metropolitan areas have been identified, no systematic study of the patterns of residential segregation of this group has been undertaken. Instead, most of the research has centered on the Hispanic population and its subgroups.

The role of residential segregation in the adaptation process is an important one. For example, Marston and Van Valey (1979) proposed a sequence of events necessary for the full integration of a minority group into the host society which includes a reduction in residential segregation as a necessary

precondition to structural integration. They stated that, as a minority group culturally adjusts and begins to improve its socioeconomic status, residential mobility into the host society fosters primary-type relationships and leads to greater integration. On the other hand, isolation of a minority group from the mainstream of U.S. society can retard adaptation by encouraging the retention of cultural traits (i.e., language, values, and behaviors).

Earlier research on the dynamics of black-white segregation employed the ecological succession model that states that the movement of a minority group into an area populated by majority group members is followed by a period of consolidation in which the minority population grows and the former inhabitants move out of the area. Following this displacement, the minority population forms an established neighborhood and the succession process is complete. While this model has accurately described the patterns of residential succession of blacks, Massey's (1983) application to the Hispanic population raises questions as to the validity of this model to describe adequately the experience of this population group. Based on data from the 1960 and 1970 censuses of population in seven selected SMSAs, Massey found that the response of a white majority to the entry of Hispanics into an established residential area is quite different from their response to the entry of blacks. In neighborhoods experiencing a growth in the Hispanic population, whites were much less likely to move out than in the case of entry of blacks. In fact, in at least half of such cases the white population continued to grow. These results imply that the existence of established Hispanic areas is very rare; therefore, a barrio-centered residential pattern does not describe the residential distribution of the Hispanic population in U.S. cities in the same way a ghetto-centered pattern characterizes the black

experience. In other words, unlike the black population, Hispanics are found in a wide variety of residential situations.

Hispanics are also less segregated than blacks from the white population in residential settings. In order to measure the degree of residential segregation between different population groups, Massey (1979) used an index of dissimilarity. This index ranges from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 100 and is interpreted as the percentage of the minority population that would have to move into a given area in order to achieve an even distribution of minority and majority members. In his study of the 29 largest urbanized areas in the United States, Massey found that Hispanic-white segregation scores ranged from 31 to 65 (averaging about 44 points) compared to a range of 59 to 93 (averaging about 83 points) for black-white segregation. Moreover, a high level of Hispanic-black segregation was also found.

Massey's (1979) results also reveal a generational effect on the degree of Hispanic-white segregation. Foreign-born Hispanics and Hispanics of foreign parentage were distinctly more segregated from whites than third- or higher-generation Hispanics. No such effect was found for blacks; blacks remain highly segregated from whites generations after their original migration to U.S. cities. He concludes that the patterns of Hispanic residential segregation parallel the experiences of European ethnics more than they do of blacks. Lopez's (1981) study of 58 southwestern cities supports this conclusion. He found that between 1960 and 1970 Mexican-American and white segregation diminished while the gap between Mexican-Americans and blacks widened. In both their increased propensity to live among whites as well as their avoidance of blacks, the residential patterns of Mexicans resemble those of European ethnics.

To understand why a lower degree of Hispanic-white segregation exists, Massey and Mullan (1984) tested the relevance of socioeconomic differences between whites, Hispanics, and blacks. Tabulations of 1960 and 1970 census data in seven SMSAs containing significant Hispanic populations revealed that increasing socioeconomic status among Hispanics is positively related to geographic mobility, which promotes spatial assimilation with whites. However, blacks are less able to convert status attainments into residential mobility into white neighborhoods. Given the same socioeconomic characteristics, blacks were much less likely than Hispanics to establish residential contact with whites.

A comparison of the residential segregation patterns of Hispanic subgroups in eight U.S. cities between 1960 and 1970 revealed that on average these groups are highly segregated from blacks and less segregated from whites (Massey, 1981). An important exception is the Puerto Rican population in the northeast, which is less segregated from blacks than from whites. This could be due to the fact that 7 percent of the Puerto Ricans in New York are classified as black and therefore might have a tendency to live in or near black neighborhoods (Massey, 1981). The results also show Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans to be highly segregated from each other, a fact Massey attributes to the recency of arrival of large shares of these groups. He concludes that, as the foreign-born stock are replaced with native-born cohorts and as the socioeconomic status of these groups rises, segregation will decline. In fact, he could find no significant differences that would suggest that the patterns of residential mobility of Hispanics will be any different from those of earlier immigrant groups in the United States.

SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF IMMIGRANT ADAPTATION

Language: Acquisition and Retention

There is a growing and increasingly vocal interest group in this country promoting English as the official language of the United States. In California, for example, a group called U.S. English was behind the November 1986 ballot initiative that passed by an overwhelming 73 to 27 percent majority and declared English to be the official language of the state of California. Similar ballot initiatives are underway in several other states with growing immigrant populations. Groups like U.S. English fear that many of the recent Asian and Hispanic immigrants to the United States are not learning English. What is the evidence?

Using tabulations of 1980 census data, Fernandez and Cresce (1985) found that 96 percent of all foreign-born Hispanics over the age of five spoke Spanish in the home, and 47 percent spoke English poorly or not at all. By type of Hispanic, 53.1 percent of foreign-born Mexicans did not speak English well or at all compared to 40.8 percent of Cubans, 40.1 percent of Central Americans, and 26.9 percent of South Americans.

Using the same data, Fernandez and Cresce found English-language acquisition among Hispanic immigrants to increase with length of residence in the United States. For example, for Mexicans who immigrated to the United States between 1975 and 1980, almost 70 percent did not speak English. This figure dropped to 51 percent for those who immigrated between 1970 and 1974 and to 44 percent for those Mexicans immigrating to the United States between 1965 and 1969. A similar trend was observed for the Cubans. Seventy-one percent of the foreign-born Cubans who arrived in the United States between 1975 and 1980 did not speak English compared with 51 percent of those who

arrived between 1970 and 1974 and 44 percent of those arriving during 1965 to 1969. Among those born in Central America, 59 percent of those who immigrated to the United States between 1975 and 1980 did not speak English compared with 40 percent of those arriving between 1970 and 1974 and 35 percent of the Central American immigrants who arrived in the United States between 1965 and 1969. The proportion of non-English-speaking South American immigrants fell from 41 percent of those who arrived between 1975 and 1980, to 28 percent of those immigrating between 1970 and 1974 and 25 percent for 1965 to 1969 arrivals.

In order to determine the rate at which shifts to English occur, Grenier (1984) analyzed data from a sample of over 7,000 Hispanic-origin males and females over the age of fourteen who reported that Spanish was usually spoken in the home when they were children. About one-half reported they had shifted to English as their major language. Grenier points out that in the absence of continuing Mexican migration, this figure would probably be closer to 70 percent. He concludes that Hispanics are shifting to English at a "relatively fast pace." Lopez (1978) also found evidence of a shift from Spanish to English among Hispanics. His study of over 1,100 Mexican households in Los Angeles showed Mexicans to be adopting English almost as quickly as European immigrants did during the height of their mass immigration. In fact, Lopez claims, "If it were not for new arrivals from Mexico, Spanish would disappear from Los Angeles nearly as rapidly as most European immigrant languages vanished from cities in the East" (p. 276). Lopez also found Spanish usage to decline with generational status. For example, whereas 84 percent of women born and raised in Mexico continued to speak Spanish at home, 66 percent of second-generation Mexican-American women used English at home, and 84 percent

of third-generation women spoke English at home. The data for men were similar, except that the second generation experienced a more rapid shift to English.

McCarthy and Valdez (1986) found the transition from Spanish to English begins among foreign-born Mexicans and proceeds rapidly for each successive generation. Based on 1980 census data for California, researchers classified foreign-born Mexicans as either short-term, cyclical, or permanent immigrants based on their length of stay in California. Less than one-quarter of the short-term immigrants--those whose average stay in California was ten to twelve weeks--were proficient in English compared with over one-third of the cyclical immigrants who stayed in California for longer periods and returned to the state on a fairly regular basis. Among permanent immigrants, a category that included those who brought their families with them and intended to stay in California permanently, nearly one-half spoke English. The most dramatic shift to English, however, occurred between foreign-born Mexicans and their first- and second-generation native-born descendants. For example, for first-generation native-born Mexicans, 25 percent were monolingual English speakers and almost 90 percent were proficient in English. Over one-half of the second-generation Mexicans spoke only English.

Attempts have also been made to identify characteristics that promote or retard English-language acquisition in immigrant families. Lopez found a relationship between low educational attainment and Spanish retention. Stevens (1985) focused on the relationship between intermarriage and language shift. Drawing on data from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, the analysis focused on children four to thirteen years of age in family households in which at least one parent had a non-English first language.

Stevens found that the mix of nativity characteristics of parents and the length of the parents' residence in the United States were the most important determinants of the probability of non-English language retention versus a shift to English by children. For example, children with two foreign-born parents were the most likely to learn a parent's non-English language; those with one foreign-born parent were less likely; and those with two native-born parents were the least likely to adopt a parent's non-English language. Also, the longer foreign-born parents have resided in the United States, the less likely it is that their children will acquire their non-English language.

A second major conclusion of this study is that, whereas ethnic intermarriage is associated with a shift to English usage by children, marriage between two people of the same ethnic background is not associated with non-English language retention by children unless both parents speak the same non-English language.

Aquirre's (1984) survey of 75 Mexican-American adolescents in California revealed that, despite the fact that the respondents were fully proficient in both English and Spanish, Spanish was the major language used in the home. The sex of the foreign-born parent was a contributing factor in determining English-language usage. For example, the presence of a Mexican-born father was found to have a greater positive effect on Spanish usage than a mother born in Mexico. The adolescent's gender also played a role in language choice, with males using Spanish more frequently than females.

Other researchers have linked increased English-language usage with rising socioeconomic status. Mirowsky and Ross (1984) found that, among Mexican-Americans, participation in a Spanish-speaking network—having a preponderance of Spanish-speaking family, friends, neighbors, and coworkers—

is associated with lower socioeconomic status than would be expected if an individual participated in an English-speaking network. Moreover, their survey of over 300 Mexican-American households in El Paso, Texas revealed that a high status among Mexican-Americans was associated with a lower expected level of participation in Spanish-speaking networks. The authors state that "this reciprocal relationship is simultaneously a force of assimilation and of dissimilation" (p. 551). On the one hand, speaking English facilitates the social mobility of Mexican-Americans, whereas retaining their native language impedes their progress.

Although not technically a social dimension of the adaptation process, the effect of language skills on earnings can provide insight as to the costs associated with maintaining one's native language. For example, McManus, Gold, and Welch (1983) constructed an English-language deficiency variable that ranked proficiency in the English language for a national sample of Hispanic men. They found no statistically significant earnings differentials between native-born white men and Hispanic men in the most English-proficient group. They also found that the income advantages associated with schooling and work experience were reduced for those Hispanic men with no English-language skills. For instance, a Hispanic immigrant with twenty years of work experience, a high school education, and no proficiency in English would earn only two-thirds as much as a native with the same experience and education and fluency in English, if both were SMSA residents. In fact, the researchers state that "differences associated with English-language skills explain virtually all of the Hispanic wage differences usually attributed to ethnicity, national origin, and time in the United States" (p. 101). In an expanded study which included earnings data for eleven immigrant groups,

McManus (1985) found the annual value of English fluency to be over $1,000 for eight of the eleven groups. In percentage terms, the gain associated with English proficiency ranged from 2.1 percent for the Portuguese to over 50 percent for the Chinese. For Hispanics, fluency in English was associated with a 27.4 percent wage gain.

By contrast, Garcia (1984) found that English acquisition had no direct effect on the earnings of Mexican immigrants and was associated with only a small economic advantage for those U.S.-born Mexican-Americans raised in English-speaking households. According to Garcia, the low educational attainment, high rate of unemployment, and low occupational status of Mexicans born in the United States lowers the earnings of this group regardless of whether an individual speaks only English or is an English-dominant bilingual.

In view of the large number of Asians immigrating to the United States during the 1970s, it is surprising that there has been little research focused on how this group adapts linguistically to its new environment. Perhaps this situation will change as the implications of accommodating non-English-speaking refugees—particularly the Vietnamese—become more apparent. Nevertheless, the few studies that have been done suggest, at least for the Japanese and Chinese, a strong generational effect on mother-tongue shift. For example, using data on over 4,000 first-, second-, and third-generation Japanese collected by the Japanese American Research Project, Woodrum (1981) found that almost 100 percent of first-generation Japanese spoke Japanese fluently and about 17 percent were also proficient in English. These figures shifted dramatically for the second generation; Japanese fluency fell to 19 percent and fluency in English rose to 93 percent. Of the third-generation Japanese, 100 percent were fluent in English and only 2 percent were also proficient in Japanese.

Earlier research based on the same data analyzed the effect of education on the retention of Japanese. In general, Montero and Tsukashima (1977) found the higher the level of education, the lower the likelihood of retaining Japanese-speaking proficiency. For instance, 40 percent of those Japanese in the study who could not speak Japanese had completed college and only 25 percent had no more than a high school education. On the other hand, 50 percent of the bilingual Japanese were high school graduates and only 22 percent had completed college.

Education also played an important role in the language shift of the Chinese, although the effect was not always in the same direction as for the Japanese. Based on data from the 1970 census, Li (1982) found a negative—but nonlinear—relationship between level of education and language shift. For those first-generation native-born Chinese with less than a high school education, about 15 percent had shifted from Chinese to English compared to about 9 percent of those who had either graduated from high school or continued their schooling beyond high school. The effect was similar for second-generation Chinese.

Likewise, Li found a negative relation between rising socioeconomic status and a shift to English. For first-generation native-born Chinese the effect is nonlinear; the likelihood of language shift is high at both extremes of socioeconomic status, with those in the middle most successful in retaining Chinese. For the second generation the pattern is nearly linear; 72 percent of those in the lowest socioeconomic category had shifted to English compared to 57 percent of those with high status. Li's findings on the negative effect of education and socioeconomic status on language shift contradict the results of other studies which have found these relationships to be positive. Li

attributes his results to the possibility that those Chinese who enjoy high status may have the resources available to retain their native traditions by sending their children to private schools that provide training in Chinese. On the other hand, those at the low end of the socioeconomic spectrum have no choice but to become "Americanized" in order to advance.

In addition, Li also examined the effect of rising generational status on mother-tongue shift. Similar to other immigrant groups, the proportion of Chinese who adopted English as their mother tongue increased with each successive generation. For example, only 1 percent of the foreign-born Chinese used English as their childhood language compared with 12 percent of the first-generation native-born and 49 percent of the second generation. However, more research concerning the language choice of Asians must be undertaken before any meaningful conclusions can be reached about what promotes English acquisition or retention of a mother-tongue language.

Education

Interest in the adaptation process of recent immigrants has also focused on their achievements in the area of education. Researchers have analyzed the level of education immigrants have when they enter this country and the economic rewards they receive in the form of occupational status and income for each additional year of schooling. Because many recent immigrants entered the United States as adults, it is likely that they have completed their education. Therefore, research has also focused on the schooling of the children of immigrants to determine to what extent the level of education secured by these children differs from their parents' levels or resembles that of the native population.

For example, using data from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Schultz (1984) analyzed the impact of parents' nativity on the school achievements of their children. He found that a child whose parents immigrated between 1974 and 1976 and graduated from high school would accumulate about 6 percent fewer years of schooling than a child of two native-born parents with a comparable level of education. However, holding the parents' education constant, a child of two immigrant parents who had resided in the United States for ten or more years would receive somewhat more schooling than the child of native-born parents. Schultz concludes that on average immigrant parents are more strongly inclined to invest in the education of their children.

Schultz's study also revealed a small but statistically significant effect for parent birthplace. Generally, the children of parents born in Asian or European countries received 2 to 5 percent more schooling holding other factors constant. By contrast, children of Mexican immigrants achieved on average about 2.5 percent less schooling. Although Schultz's analysis suggests that the educational levels of children of immigrants converge to and eventually surpass the levels achieved by the children of native-born parents, some children still remain at a disadvantage. Why do Mexicans achieve lower levels of education than Asians, and what promotes the educational achievements of Asians? In the following section several theories related to these questions are explored, and the educational attainments of Hispanics and Asians are compared with those of the native-born population.

The educational attainment of the adult Hispanic foreign-born population is significantly below the level achieved by the adult native-born population. For example, in 1980 only 37 percent of adult Hispanic immigrants were high

school graduates, compared to 68 percent of the native-born U.S. population. Moreover, only 8 percent of the Hispanic foreign-born had completed college. By contrast, 16 percent of the native-born population were college graduates in 1980 (Fernandez and Cresce, 1985). However, these figures mask the wide range of education attained by different types of foreign-born Hispanics. Foreign-born Mexicans had the lowest proportion of high school graduates--only 21 percent. On the other hand, 55 percent of Cubans and 46 percent of Central Americans had completed high school. The proportion completing high school among South American immigrants was identical to that of the native-born U.S. population.

A similar pattern emerges when U.S.-born Hispanics are included in the sample. For instance, in 1980 whites had completed a median of 12.5 years of school and blacks had completed 11.9 years. In comparison, the median number of years of schooling completed for Hispanics was 10.3. Among Hispanics, Mexicans had the least schooling, completing only 9.9 median years of formal education. Other Hispanics, which included Cubans, completed 12.1 years of school--a figure not far behind that of the white population (Moore and Pachon, 1985).

Romo (1984) examined the role of Mexican parents in the education of their children. Three types of Mexican families were surveyed: undocumented recent immigrant families, transitional families--defined as families that had been in the United States for at least five years and had at least one family member who spoke English, and families of Mexican heritage with both parents and all children born in the United States. Romo found a growing alienation from the school system over time, with U.S.-born parents more alienated than recent immigrants. One explanation offered by Romo for this increasing

negative perception of the U.S. educational system is that, whereas recent immigrants had high aspirations for their children and encouraged learning, the school experiences of U.S.-born Mexican parents sensitized them to prejudice and discrimination and reinforced their alienation from the school system.

Portes and Bach (1985) found that increased education among Mexicans led to increasingly critical perceptions of American society. Faced with hostility and discrimination when these more-educated Mexicans attempted to enter the mainstream of society, many of them choose to retreat to a more secure existence in their ethnic community. However, the researchers did not see this action as a withdrawal or failure to adapt to life in the United States but rather as evidence of an increasing awareness among Mexicans of the realities of life in America. They point out that, whereas this behavior is not in keeping with the traditional "melting pot" view of assimilation, it may be suggestive of a new, more-complex adaptation process termed by the researchers "ethnic resilience."

One theory of immigrant adaptation is that ethnic differences in the socioeconomic status of various immigrant groups tend to diminish with the passing of generations, so that second-, third-, and fourth-generations of immigrant descendants become progressively more like the overall native-born population and less like their immigrant forebearers. Based on 1980 census data for California, McCarthy and Valdez (1986) found that the educational achievement of Mexicans between the ages of 25 and 34 increased with succeeding generations. For instance, over one-half of the foreign-born Mexicans between these ages in California have less than an eighth-grade education and only 25 percent are high school graduates. By contrast, fewer

than 10 percent of the first-generation native-born Mexicans have completed no more than eight years of schooling, almost 40 percent are high school graduates, and 40 percent have continued their education beyond high school. The pattern is similar for second-generation native-born Mexicans except that a higher proportion--45 percent--have post-secondary school training. However, fewer Mexican-origin adults complete four years of college than the adult California population. Approximately 10 percent of first-generation Mexicans and 15 percent of the second generation are college graduates compared with over 20 percent of all California adults between the ages of 25 and 34.

Using data from the November 1979 Current Population Survey, Neidert and Farley (1985) also investigated generational differences in status and achievement among a large number of ethnic groups. One component of this investigation focused on the educational achievement of first-, second-, and third-generation men. Although the level of education among Mexicans increased with the number of generations in the United States--from a median of 6.9 years of school in the first generation, to 10.1 years for the second and 11.7 years for the third--this level of achievement remained significantly below that of other ethnic groups in the study. Neidert and Farley also found that "third-generation Mexicans were the least effective of any group--even less effective than Afro-Americans--in translating their educational attainment into occupational prestige" (p. 848).

Researchers who have examined the adaptation processes of European immigrants during the late 19th and early 20th centuries as well as researchers who have analyzed these processes for the more recent Hispanic and Asian arrivals have stressed the importance of education in facilitating the

socioeconomic mobility of immigrants (Sowell, 1981; Dinnerstein and Reimers, 1975; McCarthy and Valdez, 1986). Therefore, the extent to which Mexicans have been able to convert education into earnings can provide information as to the prospects for and the speed of their integration into American society. For instance, Carliner (1976) used data from the 1971 Current Population Survey to test whether male earnings functions differ for whites, blacks, and five Spanish groups--Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Central/South Americans, and "other Spanish." Black men fared worst and had returns to education that were just 70 percent as large as those for white men. Mexican men fared slightly better than blacks, but they were the only Spanish group to have a significantly lower education coefficient than whites. In fact, Carliner found that Cubans and Central or South Americans received 30 percent more income than whites for each year of schooling. Puerto Ricans and "other Spanish" received about the same return as whites. Carliner admits that more research needs to be done in order to uncover why certain groups have low returns to education, but he does suggest that labor market discrimination may keep Mexicans and blacks out of high-status, high-income jobs.

Unlike Mexicans, the educational level of Asians is comparable with and in most cases above that of the native population. For example, in 1980, 35 percent of foreign- and native-born Asian adults had graduated from college, compared to 17 percent of white adults (Gardner et al., 1985). Among Asians, Indians had the highest proportion of college graduates--over 66 percent. The percent completing college among the other Asian groups included 42 percent of Filipinos, 34 percent of Koreans, almost 30 percent for the Chinese, and about 24 percent for the Japanese. The Vietnamese, with 13 percent completing

college, were the only major Asian group with a lower proportion completing college than the native population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1984). The proportion of high school graduates among Asians is also impressive. For the six major Asian groups mentioned above, the percentage completing high school ranged from a high of 89 percent for Asian Indians to a low of 60 percent for the Chinese. The comparable figure for the native-born was about 67 percent.

According to Hirschman and Wong (1983), the higher educational attainment of Asians is not a recent phenomenon. Their study found that by 1920 the educational gap between Asian immigrants and the native population had narrowed substantially, and by 1930 Asian children were more likely to be attending school than their white counterparts. Hirschman and Wong cite past restrictive immigration policies, which allowed only very selective and determined Asians to enter the Unites States, as one possible explanation for the high level of education of Asians in the pre-World War II period. They explain the more recent educational achievements of Asians as a function of parental support and encouragement.

Other researchers have attempted to identify additional factors that may influence the high level of education attained by Asians. Schwartz (1971) conducted a survey in 1966 of over 2,000 Japanese and white students enrolled in Los Angeles city schools and concluded that the high achievement of Japanese pupils was due to a family structure and values that were rooted in the Japanese culture rather than to the acquisition of American values. Montero and Tsukashima (1977), on the other hand, found that the greater the degree of integration among Japanese the greater the level of education. For example, this study of over 2,300 second-generation Japanese-Americans found that Japanese who spoke only English, who did not live in a Japanese

community, who had non-Japanese friends, and who were raised in households in which the father considered himself to be mainly American as opposed to mainly Japanese were more likely to be college graduates than their "unassimilated" counterparts. Montero and Tsukashima conclude that it is their prior acquisition of American values and behaviors that promotes the educational achievements of the Japanese rather than education that stimulates their integration into American society.

Although there is still some disagreement as to what motivates Asians to attain such high levels of education, the fact remains that their achievements in this area are extraordinary. Some researchers have found, however, that the economic rewards to education may be lower for some Asians than for native-born whites. A study by Nee and Sanders (1985), for instance, found that native-born whites, U.S.-born Japanese, and U.S.-born Chinese received on the average $904, $900, and $770, respectively, for each year of schooling. In 1979 college-educated whites earned more than $25,000, compared with $23,000 for similarly educated U.S.-born Japanese and $21,000 for Chinese-Americans. U.S.-born Filipino college graduates fared the worst, earning only $16,000 in 1979. The returns to education for Asian immigrants were substantially lower than for native-born whites. Hirschman and Wong (1981) also found the earnings of Asian immigrants to be below those of similarly educated whites, and they found Filipinos to be the most disadvantaged Asian minority in terms of occupational structure and earnings.

However, when compared to other immigrants in the United States, Asians are very successful in converting their educational credentials into occupational status. Neidert and Farley (1985) compared the returns to education for first-, second-, and third-generation ethnic groups and found

Asians to be especially effective in terms of occupational achievement. In fact, in a ranking of occupational returns to educational attainment classified by ancestry, Asians received the highest returns in all three generations.

Similarly, Woodrum (1981) found the median education, occupational status, and income for the Japanese to be above those of other minorities in the United States, promoting the image of the Japanese as a model minority. However, Woodrum does not find much support for this "assimilation success story" in terms of the rate of return to educational achievement for the Japanese in the labor market. He points out that the most-educated Japanese in professional occupations received less compensation than similarly educated whites in equivalent jobs. Citing figures from a study by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, he reports that when adjustments for occupational prestige, age, education, annual weeks worked, hours worked, and average income in state of residence are made, Japanese males earned 88 percent as much as white males in 1975.

As in the case of Mexicans, there seems to be some evidence of lower rates of return for educational achievements among Asians compared with native-born whites. Although the level of education for Asians is substantially above that of Mexicans, Asians do not seem to be immune to the disadvantages associated with minority status. Woodrum compares the experiences of the Japanese to those of other racial minorities in the United States, pointing out that racial disadvantages persist even at high levels of socioeconomic status.

SUMMARY

In discussing the demographic and social dimensions of adaptation processes of recent Hispanic and Asian immigrants, we have attempted to identify those situations where integration occurs within an immigrant cohort and/or across generations of immigrants. The findings of the majority of studies presented above indicate that the most significant reductions in differences with the native population occur for the third-generation descendants of immigrants (immigrants are defined here as the first generation). For instance, Bean et al. (1984) found that, for third-generation Mexican women, current fertility converges to the levels of other non-Hispanic white women. Moreover, native-born Asians exhibit lower fertility than immigrant Asian women. Generational status was also found to be a factor contributing to the propensity to intermarry for both Hispanics and Asians. Third-generation Mexican women intermarry to a greater extent than do second-generation or Mexican immigrant women. According to Kitano et al. (1984), generational differences are the most important factor related to outmarriage among Asians, with the third generation outmarrying to a greater extent than previous generations. Moreover, Massey's (1979, 1981, 1983) studies of the patterns of residential segregation among Hispanics revealed that third-generation Hispanics are significantly less segregated from whites than foreign-born Hispanics and Hispanics of foreign parentage.

Focusing on the social dimensions of adaptation, the most dramatic comparisons can also be made between first-generation immigrants and their third-generation descendants. For instance, Lopez (1978) found a significant decline in Spanish usage between first-generation Mexican immigrants and third-generation Mexican-Americans, as did McCarthy and Valdez (1986).

English fluency among Asians also increased with rising generational status. In his study of first-, second-, and third-generation Japanese, Woodrum (1981) found that 100 percent of the third generation could speak English fluently. The amount of time Mexicans spend in school was also found to increase for each successive generation. According to Neidert and Farley (1985), third-generation Mexicans achieved a higher average level of education than did first- or second-generation Mexicans.

There is also evidence suggesting that immigrants themselves are making adjustments to life in the United States. Wolpin (1984), for example, found that Asians and Hispanics are less likely to live in a nuclear household upon their arrival in the United States than the native population. However, after 20 years an immigrant and a native would have about the same likelihood of being observed in such a household. Moreover, McCarthy and Valdez (1986) determined that Mexican immigrants who intend to make California their permanent home are gaining English-language proficiency more quickly than their transient counterparts. Fernandez and Cresce (1985) also found English-speaking skills to increase among Hispanic immigrants with length of time in the United States.

Relatively few studies discussed in this paper investigate adjustments by the immigrant generation as its length of residence in the United States increases. This does not necessarily imply that the adaptation process suddenly begins with the native-born descendants of immigrants. Instead it reflects a gap in research examining the adjustment processes of immigrants.

In reporting on the adaptation patterns of Hispanic and Asian immigrants, several researchers have noted factors that may promote or retard the integration process. Yinger (1985), for example, treats these factors as

variables with values that range from "highly assimilative" to "highly dissimilative." Several of Yinger's variables are particularly significant to our discussion of the demographic and social dimensions of immigrant adaptation.

For example, Yinger points out that the large and growing group size of the Hispanic population in the United States may limit the speed of its integration into the mainstream of U.S. society. Asians also make up a large and growing population in the United States. Moreover, the Hispanic and Asian populations contain high proportions of new arrivals to whom Yinger points as another negative influence on the adaptation process. On the positive side, both Hispanics and Asians entered the United States voluntarily. However, Mexico's geographic location allows for frequent contact with Mexican relatives and friends, thus reinforcing cultural values and behaviors. Returning to their homeland is more difficult for Asians; therefore, Asians may be influenced by the majority culture to a greater extent than Mexicans. Finally, the tendency for immigrants to cluster together in residential settings is cited by Yinger as another negative influence on the adaptation process. Although concentrations of Mexicans exist—especially in the southwest—Massey's studies of residential segregation patterns reveal that Hispanics are increasingly found in a wide variety of residential settings.

The inability of Hispanic and Asian immigrants to speak English may initially inhibit their progress as they attempt to move into the mainstream of American society. However, English fluency among Hispanics and Asians increases dramatically for subsequent native-born generations. The high average level of education among Asians will help speed this group's adjustment and facilitate its socioeconomic mobility. On the other hand,

although the average level of education increases for each generation of Mexicans, the number of years of completed schooling still lags behind that of the native-born--even by the third generation. Perhaps more than any other factor, low levels of education among Mexicans may hinder their social mobility.

Thus far we have only discussed aspects of the adaptation process that immigrants themselves can control. For instance, immigrants can learn English, they can continue their schooling, and they can move into ethnically diverse neighborhoods. However, immigrants cannot control the discrimination and prejudice they may face as they attempt to advance into the mainstream of U.S. society. If immigrants learn our language and adopt our values and behaviors and still are denied acceptance as full members of American society, we cannot blame the immigrants for failing to adjust. The responsibility of the host population in facilitating the adaptation of immigrants should not be ignored. As this review of the literature has shown, the recent Hispanic and Asian immigrant populations are well on their way to adapting to life in the United States. The speed of their progress may be largely determined by the willingless of the majority population to make the accommodations necessary to facilitate their mobility.

REFERENCES

Alba, Richard D. 1985. "Interethnic and Interracial Marriage in the 1980 Census." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Washington, D. C., August 26-30.

Aquirre, Adalberto, Jr. 1984. "Language Use in Bilingual Mexican American Households." Social Science Quarterly 65 (June):565-572.

Bean, Frank D., Ruth M. Cullen, Elizabeth H. Stephen, and C. Gray Swicegood. 1984. "Generational Differences in Fertility among Mexican Americans: Implications for Assessing the Effects of Immigration." Social Science Quarterly 65 (June):573-582.

Bean, Frank D., and C. Gray Swicegood. 1982. "Generation, Female Education and Mexican American Fertility." Social Science Quarterly 63 (March): 131-144.

Beaujot, Roderic P., Karol J. Krotki, and P. Krishnan. 1982. "Analysis of Ethnic Fertility Differentials through the Consideration of Assimilation." International Journal of Comparative Sociology 23:62-70.

Blau, Peter M., Carolyn Beeker, and Kevin M. Fitzpatrick. 1984. "Intersecting Social Affiliations and Intermarraige." Social Forces 62 (March): 585-606.

Bossard, James H. S. 1939. "Nationality and Nativity as Factors in Marriage." American Sociological Review 4:792-798.

Bugelski, B. R. 1961. "Assimilation Through Intermarriage." Social Forces 40 (December):148-153.

Carliner, Geoffrey. 1976. "Returns to Education for Blacks, Anglos, and Five Spanish Groups." Journal of Human Resources 11 (Spring):172-184.

Cazares, Ralph B., Edward Murguia, and W. Parker Frisbie. 1984. "Mexican American Intermarriage in a Nonmetropolitan Context." Social Science Quarterly 65 (June):626-634.

Dinnerstein, Leonard, and David M. Reimers. 1975. Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration and Assimilation. New York, New York: Harper and Row.

Fernandez, Edward W., and Arthur R. Cresce. 1985. "Social and Economic Status of the Hispanic Foreign-Born: The Assimilation Experience." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Population Association of America, Boston, Massachusetts, March 28-30.

Garcia, Philip. 1984. "Dual-Language Characteristics and Earnings: Male Mexican Workers in the U.S." Social Science Research 13 (Spring): 221-235.

Gardner, Robert W., Bryant Robey, and Peter C. Smith. 1985. "Asian Americans: Growth, Change, and Diversity." Population Bulletin, vol. 40, no. 4 (Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, Inc.)

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman. 1970. The Mexican American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority. New York, New York: The Free Press.

Grenier, Gilles. 1984. "Shifts to English as Usual Language by Americans of Spanish Mother Tongue." Social Science Quarterly 65 (June):537-550.

Gurak, Douglas. 1978. "Sources of Ethnic Fertility Differences: An Examination of Five Minority Groups." Social Science Quarterly 59 (September):295-310.

Hirschman, Charles, and Morrison G. Wong. 1983. "The Extraordinary Educational Attainment of Asian-Americans: A Search for Historical Evidence and Explanations." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, August 31-September 4.

_____. 1981. "Trends in Socioeconomic Achievement Among Immigrant and Native-Born Asian-Americans, 1960-1976." Sociological Quarterly 22 (Autumn):495-514.

Holscher, Louis, Charles Varni, and Letty Naranjo. 1979. "Chicano Exogamous Marriages in New Mexico." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, Anaheim.

Johnson, Nan E., and Ryoko Nishida. 1980. "Minority-Group Status and Fertility: A Study of Japanese and Chinese in Hawaii and California." American Journal of Sociology 86 (November):496-511.

Kitano, Harry H. L., Wai-Tsang Yeung, Lynn Chai, and Herbert Hatanaka. 1984. "Asian-American Interracial Marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family 46 (February):179-190.

Lopez, David E. 1978. "Chicano Language Loyalty in an Urban Setting." Sociology and Social Research 62 (January):267-278.

Lopez, Manual Marino. 1981. "Patterns of Interethnic Residential Segregation in the Urban Southwest, 1960-1970." Social Science Quarterly 62 (March): 50-63.

Marston, Wilfred G., and Thomas L. Van Valey. 1979. "The Role of Residential Segregation in the Assimilation Process." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 441 (January):13-25.

Massey, Douglas S. 1983. "A Research Note on Residential Succession: The Hispanic Case." Social Forces 61 (March):825-833.

_____. 1981. "Hispanic Residential Segregation: A Comparison of Mexicans, Cubans and Puerto Ricans." Sociology and Social Research 65 (3):311-322.

_____. 1979. "Residential Segregation of Spanish Americans in United States Urbanized Areas." Demography 16 (November):553-563.

Massey, Douglas S., and Brenda P. Mullan. 1984. "Processes of Hispanic and Black Spatial Assimilation." American Journal of Sociology 89 (January): 836-873.

McCarthy, Kevin F., and R. Burciaga Valdez. 1986. Current and Future Effects of Mexican Immigration in California. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.

McManus, Walter. 1985. "Labor Market Assimilation of Immigrants: The Importance of Language Skills." Contemporary Policy Issues 3 (Spring): 77-89.

McManus, Walter, William Gould, and Finis Welch. 1983. "Earnings of Hispanic Men: The Role of English Language Proficiency." Journal of Labor Economics 1 (April):101-130.

Mirowsky, John, and Catherine E. Ross. 1984. "Language Networks and Social Status Among Mexican Americans." Social Science Quarterly 65 (June): 551-564.

Moore, Joan W., and Harry Pachon. 1985. Hispanics in the United States. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Montero, Darrel. 1981. "The Japanese Americans: Changing Patterns of Assimilation over Three Generations." American Sociological Review 46 (December):829-839.

Montero, Darrel, and Ronald Tsukashima. 1977. "Assimilation and Educational Achievement: The Case of the Second Generation Japanese-American." Sociological Quarterly 18 (Autumn):490-503.

Murguia, Edward, and Ralph B. Cazares. 1982. "Intermarriage of Mexican Americans." Marriage and Family Review 5 (Spring): 91-100.

Nee, Victor, and Jimy Sanders. 1985. "Socioeconomic Achievements of Asian Americans." Ethnic and Racial Studies 8 (January):75-93.

Neidert, Lisa J., and Reynolds Farley. 1985. "Assimilation in the United States: An Analysis of Ethnic and Generation Differences in Status and Achievement." American Sociological Review 50 (December):840-850.

Portes, Alejandro, and Robert L. Bach. 1985. Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Romo, Harriett. 1984. "The Mexican Origin Population's Differing Perceptions of their Children's Schooling." Social Science Quarterly 65 (June): 635-650.

Schultz, T. Paul. 1984. "The Schooling and Health of Children of U.S. Immigrants and Natives." Pp. 251-288 in T. Paul Schultz and Kenneth I. Wolpin (eds.), Research in Population Economics. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press, Inc.

Schwartz, Audrey. 1971. "The Culturally Advantaged: A Study of Japanese-American Pupils." Sociology and Social Research 55 (April):341-353.

Sowell, Thomas. 1981. Ethnic America: A History. New York, New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Stevens, Gillian. 1985. "Nativity, Intermarriage and Mother-Tongue-Shift." American Sociological Review 50 (February):74-83.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1984. "Socioeconomic Characteristics of U.S. Foreign-Born Population Detailed in Census Bureau Tabulations." U.S. Department of Commerce News, Washington, D.C., October 17.

Wolpin, Kenneth I. 1984. "The Household Structure of U.S. Immigrants and Natives." In T. Paul Schultz and Kenneth I. Wolpin (eds.), Research in Population Economics. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press, Inc.

Woodrum, Eric. 1981. "An Assessment of Japanese American Assimilation, Pluralism, and Subordination." American Journal of Sociology 87 (July): 157-169.

Yinger, J. Milton. 1985. "Assimilation in the United States: The Mexican-Americans." Pp. 30-55 in Walker Connor (ed.), Mexican-Americans in Comparative Perspective. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.

December 1986

The Urban Institute

IMPACTS OF IMMIGRATION IN CALIFORNIA

Related Titles

de la Puente, Manuel, and Marc Bendick, Jr., "Employment and Training Programs for Migrant and Refugee Youth: Lessons from the United States Experience." The Urban Institute, August 1983.

Muller, Thomas, The Fourth Wave: California's Newest Immigrants, A Summary. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1984.

Espenshade, Thomas J., and Tracy Ann Goodis, "Recent Immigrants to Los Angeles: Characteristics and Labor Market Impacts." Urban Institute Policy Discussion Paper PDS-85-1, May 1985.

Koss, Margo, and Harry Hatry, "Human Services Needs and Resources in Long Beach." Urban Institute report to the City of Long Beach, May 1985. Also available from City Manager's Office, City of Long Beach, California.

Manson, Donald M., Thomas J. Espenshade, and Thomas Muller, "Mexican Immigration to Southern California: Issues of Job Competition and Worker Mobility." Urban Institute Policy Discussion Paper PDS-85-2, August 1985.

Connor, Walker (ed.), Mexican-Americans in Comparative Perspective. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1985.

Muller, Thomas, and Thomas J. Espenshade, The Fourth Wave: California's Newest Immigrants. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1985.

de Leeuw, Frank, "The Economic Effects of Immigration: Specification of a Model." Urban Institute Policy Discussion Paper PDS-85-3, December 1985.

Taylor, J. Edward, "Selectivity of Undocumented Mexico-U.S. Migrants and Implications for U.S. Immigration Reform." Urban Institute Policy Discussion Paper PDS-85-4, December 1985.

Goodis, Tracy Ann, and Thomas J. Espenshade, "Immigration to Southern California: Fact and Fiction." Urban Institute Policy Discussion Paper PDS-86-1, May 1986.

Espenshade, Thomas J., "Why the United States Needs Immigrants." Urban Institute Policy Discussion Paper PDS-86-2, August 1986.

Goodis, Tracy Ann, "Adaptation Processes of Recent Immigrants to the United States: A Review of Demographic and Social Aspects." Urban Institute Policy Discussion Paper PDS-86-3, December 1986.

Goodis, Tracy Ann, "A Layman's Guide to 1986 U.S. Immigration Reform." Urban Institute Policy Discussion Paper PDS-86-4, December 1986.

How To Inquire about Papers and Publications

For information about obtaining copies of Policy Discussion Papers and other Urban Institute papers, contact the Library/Information Clearinghouse, The Urban Institute, 2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20037; telephone (202) 857-8688 or (202) 857-8687.

For information about obtaining copies of Urban Institute Press publications, contact The Urban Institute Press, P.O. Box 19958, Hampden Station, Baltimore, Maryland 21211; telephone (301) 338-6951.